REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 4, and 13-15 are amended. Support for the amendments can be found, at least, within Figs. 4 and 5, for example. No new matter is added. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 because the amendments:

(a) place the application in condition for allowance (for the reasons discussed herein); (b) do not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and (c) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendments are necessary and were not earlier presented because they are made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

I. <u>Interview</u>

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Reynolds in the September 23, 2010 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

II. Claim Rejections

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ridgeway '274 (U.S. Patent No. 6,302,274) in view of Stone (U.S. Patent No. 2,993,587) and Ridgeway '844 (U.S. Patent No. 6,311,844); rejects claims 4, 8, 12, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ridgeway '274 in view of Stone and Ridgeway '844 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Atsushi (JP-A-11-208727); rejects claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ridgeway '274 in view of Stone and Ridgeway '844 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Paige (U.S. Patent No. 3,226,005); and rejects claim 11

under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ridgeway '274 in view of Stone and Ridgeway '844 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ridgeway '743 (U.S. Patent No. 4,852,743). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references fail to render obvious a shock absorbing packaging material wherein at least one of the first side supporting piece or the second side supporting piece contains a cutout positioned to facilitate the disassembly of the shock absorbing packaging material from an assembled state, as recited by independent claim 1.

Specifically, as discussed and agreed to in the personal interview, the holes 90 of Ridgeway '944 are disposed at the intersections of folding lines to allow easier folding of the end portions. See col. 11, lines 31-39 of Ridgeway '844. Further, as agreed to at the personal interview, the holes 90 of Ridgeway are not positioned to facilitate the disassembly of its packaging structure. Specifically, in an assembled state, the holes 90 of Ridgeway' 844 are not able to facilitate disassembly as they will be deformed and inaccessible as a result of the folding they are meant to facilitate.

As such, the applied references fail to disclose or render obvious at least one of the first side supporting piece or the second side supporting piece contains a cutout positioned to facilitate the disassembly of the shock absorbing packaging material from an assembled state.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references fail to disclose or render obvious a shock absorbing packaging material wherein the first side supporting piece that is folded inward of the tube body is formed in the shape of a pole and the second side supporting piece that is folded inward of the tube body is formed in the shape of a pole, such that a front end portion of the first side supporting piece contacts the outer peripheral edge portion of the first side intermediate frame member and a front end portion of the second side

supporting piece contacts the outer peripheral edge portion of the second side intermediate frame member, as recited by dependent claim 4.

Specifically, as discussed and agreed to at the personal interview, Atsushi clearly fails to describe the structure as claimed by dependent claim 4. The parallelopipe k of Atsushi has outer edge portions all of which contact another portion of the same parallelopipe and do not come in contact with other elements of the impact absorbing package. Nothing within the disclosure of Atsushi describes the features of dependent claim 4.

As such the applied references fail to disclose or render obvious a front end portion of the first side supporting piece contacts the outer peripheral edge portion of the first side intermediate frame member and a front end portion of the second side supporting piece contacts the outer peripheral edge portion of the second side intermediate frame member.

Accordingly, the applied references fails to disclose or render obvious each and every element of claims 1 and 4. As such, claims 1 and 4 are patentable. The dependent claims are also patentable, at least, for their dependency from independent claims 1, as well as for the additional features they recite. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted

Registration No. 27,075

Kevin R. Davis

Registration No. 64,667

JAO:KRD/nlp

Attachment:

Petition for Extension of Time

Date: September 28, 2010

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION

Please grant any extension necessary for entry of this filing;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461